

R



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/533,468	03/23/2000	DORON JUSTER	1018.077US1	9906

23441 7590 03/28/2003

LAW OFFICES OF MICHAEL DRYJA  
704 228TH AVENUE NE  
PMB 694  
SAMMAMISH, WA 98074

EXAMINER

NARAYANASWAMY, SINDYA

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2154

DATE MAILED: 03/28/2003

2

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PD

**Office Action Summary**

Applicati n No.

09/533,468

Applicant(s)

JUSTER ET AL.

Examiner

Sindya Narayanaswamy

Art Unit

2154

127

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 March 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1 – 16 are presented for examination.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-4, 6-9, 12-14 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (hereinafter AAPA) in view of Dyson et al, US- 6,269,399.

4. As per claim 1, AAPA teach the invention substantially as claimed including a computer-implemented method comprising: sending a first request to create a local queue by an application of a client from a function of the client to a server and creating the local queue when determined by the server that the user has permission (Specification, page 1, lines 17- page 2 line 2).

5. AAPA do not specifically teach the method of sending second requests to a service having permission to create local queues and the method of the service determined that the 2<sup>nd</sup> request originated locally, calling the server by the service to create local queues.

Art Unit: 2154

6. Dyson et al teach the method of sending second requests to a service having permission to create local queues and when the service determined that the 2<sup>nd</sup> request originated locally (22, Fig. 1), calling the server by the service to create local queues (30, Fig. 1) (Fig. 3A). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of AAPA and Dyson et al because Dyson et al's method of creating local queues increases the managerial duties of the client-side of the system. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do because it allows for greater user and client control.

7. As per claim 2, AAPA teach the method of using only user-level security (page 2, lines 3-11).

8. As per claim 3, Dyson et al teach the method wherein the service, by calling the server only upon determining that the second request originated locally provides for local-level security (secure routing) (col. 1, lines 60-67).

9. As per claim 4, Dyson et al teach the method comprising of a transactional message service (col. 1, lines 28-34).

10. As per claim 6, Dyson et al teach the method where the service is running on the client (22, 30, Fig. 1).

11. As per claim 7, AAPA does not teach the method wherein the user by default lacks permission to create local queues. However, it would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

art to incorporate the default setting for the user to have no permission to create local queues. One with ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to improve security.

12. As per claim 13, Dyson et al teach the system wherein the client further comprises a computer-readable medium and a processor, such that at least one of the application program, the function, and the service is executed by the processor from the medium (20, Fig. 1) (col. 8, lines 34-44).

13. As per claims 11 and 16, they are the machine-readable claims and computerized system claims of claim 7, and are rejected under the same reasoning as claims 7.

14. As per claims 8, 9, 12 and 14 they are the machine-readable claims and computerized system claims of claims 1-3 and are rejected under the same reasoning as claims 1-3.

15. Claims 5, 10 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (hereinafter AAPA) in view of Dyson et al, US-6,269,399, further in view of Blount et al – US-6,070,184.

16. As per claim 5, Blount et al teach the method wherein the function is accessed by the application via an application programming interface (HTML forms) of the function (col. 16, lines 44-57). It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time to incorporate the teachings of AAPA and Dyson et al with the teachings of Blount et al because Blount et al's

method of using an API improves the usability of the method. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time would have been motivated to do so because it would allow for users to navigate the system with ease.

17. As per claims 10, Dyson et al teach the service comprising of a transactional message service (col. 1, lines 28-34). Dyson et al do not teach the service comprising a transactional message service.

18. However, Blount et al teach the method wherein the function is accessed by the application via an application programming interface (HTML forms) of the function (col. 16, lines 44-57). It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time to incorporate the teachings of AAPA and Dyson et al with the teachings of Blount et al because Blount et al's method of using an API improves the usability of the method. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time would have been motivated to do so because it would allow for users to navigate the system with ease.

19. As per claims 15, it is the computerized system claims of claim 10, and is rejected under the same reasoning as claim 10.

### ***Conclusion***

20. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

a. US-6,490,680, by Scheidt et al, "Access Control and Authorization System"


- b. US-6,323,881 B1, by Broulik et al., "Web Based GUI Server and Method For A Telecommunication Node"
  - c. US-6,298,386 B1, by Vahalia et al., "Network File Server Having A Message Collector Queue For Connection And Connectionless Oriented Protocols"
  - d. US-6,161,125, Traversat et al, 'Generic Schema for Storing Configuration Information On A Client Computer'
  - e. US-5,678,041, Baker et al, "System and Method for Restricting User Access Rights on the Internet Based on Rating Information Stored in a Relational Database"
  - f. Re: Credit Cards with Internet Fraud Insurance, Peter Leppik
21. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sindya Narayanaswamy whose telephone number 703-305-8473. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 am to 5 pm, first Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (703) 305-9678. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-5404 for regular communications and (703) 305-5404 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

March 24, 2003

Sindya Narayanaswamy

  
ZARNI MAUNG  
PRIMARY EXAMINER